
POLITICAL AFFAIRS

Theoretical Organ of the Communist Party, U. S. A.

VOL. XLIII, NO. 7

JULY, 1964

HYMAN LUMER, Editor BETTY GANNETT, Executive Editor
ISRAEL GABIN, Circulation Manager

CONTENTS

Editorial Comment

"Soviet Anti-Semitism":
The Status of Soviet Jews 1

Elizabeth Gurley Flynn
Not Yet End of
Road on McCarran Act 16

Betty Gannett
Crisis in Southeast Asia 21

George A. Meyers
The Wallace Campaign
in Maryland 36

Herbert Aptheker
Philosophy, Fear and Freedom 42

Erik Bert
Thorstein Veblen: Social Critic 47

BOOK REVIEWS

William Weinstone
A Crude Distortion of History 58

Ben Levine
Psychoanalysis Dissected 62

POLITICAL AFFAIRS is published monthly by Political Affairs Publishers, Inc., at 23 West 26th Street, New York N. Y. 10010, to whom all orders, subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be addressed. Subscription rates: \$5.00 a year; \$2.50 for six months; for foreign and Canada: \$6.00 a year. Single copies 50 cents. Second class postage paid at the Post Office in New York, N. Y.

"Soviet Anti-Semitism": The Status of Soviet Jews

In our preceding editorial article, we dealt with a number of questions centering around the appearance of the Kichko book *Judaism Without Embellishment*. We turn now to certain other aspects of the status of Jews in the Soviet Union.

Jewish Culture

The fate which befell Jewish cultural institutions and leading Jewish cultural figures under Stalin in the period beginning in 1948—a fate not confined to Jews—is too well known to require detailed recounting here. It is rather on the steps taken to rectify these terrible injustices and crimes that we wish to dwell, since these have become a center of current controversy.

Even a brief survey shows that these steps have been considerable.* Within the past several years, first of all, many Jewish cultural figures who had been unjustly executed or imprisoned have been rehabilitated—a rehabilitation which has been much more than nominal. Memorials have been erected in their honor, streets named after them, exhibits of their lives and work presented. And the works of the Jewish writers among them have been extensively published.

In the Yiddish language, books by the great classical writers Sholem Aleichem, I. L. Peretz and Mendele Mocher Sforim have appeared, as well as a novel and an anthology of short stories by David Bergelson, a volume of poetry by Asher Schwartzman and another by Aaron Vergelis. These were printed in editions ranging from 10,000 to 30,000.

*For additional details not presented here, see among other publications the pamphlet by Herbert Aptheker, *The Fraud of "Soviet Anti-Semitism,"* New Century Publishers, 1962; "Facts and Figures About Jews in the Soviet Union," *Morning Freiheit*, November 10, 1963; Jessica Smith, "Jewish Culture in the Soviet Union," *New World Review*, February, 1963, "On Charges of "Soviet Anti-Semitism," *New World Review*, March, 1963.

In Russian and other languages, Yiddish writers have been very widely published. The Novosti Press Agency reports (*Morning Freiheit*, November 10, 1963) that "in the last seven years 187 books of 80 Yiddish writers have been published in 15 languages of the peoples of the USSR and 4 foreign languages in a total edition of 14 million copies." In 1959, the centennial of Sholem Aleichem's birth was publicly celebrated with the participation of leading Soviet government and literary figures. On this occasion, a special six-volume edition of his works was published in 250,000 copies, and a special commemorative postage stamp was issued. Last year a biography and literary criticism of Sholem Aleichem by Professor Hersch Remenik in Russian appeared, whose introduction states that no less than 500 editions of his works totaling 6 million copies had appeared in the Soviet Union.

Since August, 1961, a Yiddish bimonthly magazine, *Soviet Homeland*, has been published in 25,000 copies under the editorship of Aaron Vergelis. More than a hundred Yiddish writers have found an outlet for their creative efforts in its pages. Now, according to a recent announcement by Vergelis, the magazine is to be published monthly. In addition, it will undertake the publication of books in Yiddish.

Numerous theatrical and musical companies exist, which tour the country and appear before audiences totaling millions of people. In 1962, some 300,000 witnessed such performances in Moscow alone. Some of these groups are professional, some amateur, some mixed. Moscow boasts a professional drama group headed by the veteran actor Benjamin Schwartz. Riga has a permanent chorus of 100, part amateur, part professional. Vilna has an amateur dramatic group of over 50, a chorus of 30, a string orchestra and a jazz band, recruited from among its Jewish population. All this is aside from the numerous productions of Jewish plays or plays on Jewish themes in Russian and other languages.

Meetings of *Soviet Homeland* readers have been held, at which Yiddish readings and songs were presented. Song books and numerous recordings of songs and readings in Yiddish have appeared.

The list could be expanded. Clearly, this is a far cry from an official policy of forcibly suppressing Jewish culture, such as is recklessly charged in certain circles in this country. The facts belie the statement of Senator Javits at the American Jewish Conference of Soviet Jewry that the Soviet government "crushes every vestige of Jewish culture." Nor is it true, as Senator Ribicoff asserts, that in the case of the executed or imprisoned Jewish cultural leaders "no effort was made

for public rehabilitation as it has been done in the cases of other Stalinist victims." If, to take but one instance, a public monument to the noted actor Solomon Mikhoels in Moscow at whose unveiling leading public officials spoke is not public rehabilitation, we should like to know what is. There is just as little truth in Senator Ribicoff's charge that in Moscow and Leningrad "there is neither a professional nor an amateur Jewish theater nor any other Jewish cultural or artistic group permitted to exist." Such inventions are but a part of the arsenal of unreasoning anti-Sovietism.

At the same time, however, the restoration of Yiddish cultural institutions admittedly falls considerably short of what existed prior to 1948. For example, the publication of books in Yiddish has so far been limited to a small number of volumes. There are no Yiddish newspapers other than the *Birobidjaner Shtern*. The state theater in Moscow headed by Mikhoels has not been restored. No schools or classes in the Yiddish language exist. The question naturally arises: why has the process been thus limited?

This is defended by Soviet authorities on the ground that, thanks to the high degree of assimilation among Soviet Jews, the demand for such institutions has drastically diminished. Against this, it is contended by various groups in this country, including even some progressive Jewish circles, that since in the 1959 census some 472,000 Soviet Jews designated Yiddish as their mother tongue, a substantial demand does exist. Further, however small the number desiring Yiddish cultural forms might become, it is incumbent on the Soviet government, in the name of full equality of all national groups, to make them freely available.

We shall not presume here to judge the magnitude of this demand in the Soviet Union. But whatever it may be it can be argued, we think, that the circumstances warrant leaning over backward to assure its fulfillment. Not to do so is to give insufficient consideration to the impact on the Jewish people, including those who do not speak Yiddish, of the excesses against Jewish cultural institutions and leaders in the latter days of the Stalin regime. It is to reckon without the heightened consciousness of Jews everywhere, including Soviet Jews, of their Jewish identity as a consequence of the crimes of Hitlerism. This is aptly described by Jessica Smith ("Jewish Culture in the Soviet Union," *New World Review*, February, 1963) in connection with a visit to a factory in Gorky in 1945. She writes: "When the chief engineer, who showed us around, found out that my husband was also a Jew, he flung his arms around him with special warmth. He told us then that before the war he had practically forgotten that he was a

Jew, but that Hitler's brutal anti-Semitism had revived in him a new consciousness of his Jewish heritage." The crimes of 1948 and after, even though they were not confined to Jews, could only serve to strengthen that consciousness.

In the light of this, it seems to us that not to go out of one's way with regard to the availability of such things as Yiddish newspapers or classes (whose viability or lack of it would soon show itself in practice), or of religious articles, reflects an insufficient sensitivity to the continued existence and effects of anti-Semitism.

We must reject, however, any idea that this represents a policy of forced assimilation of Soviet Jews. We believe that the criticisms levelled against the Soviet Union on this score, however well-intended, are ill-founded and harmful in their effects. Such critics fail to give adequate consideration to the pronounced changes both in the character of Soviet Jewry and in Soviet life in general, as a consequence of which the situation today is in important respects not comparable to that prior to 1948.

What Has Changed?

The process of assimilation, whether one likes it or not, has continued to take its inexorable course. This process was already well under way in the thirties, even while the flowering of Yiddish cultural activities was at its peak. And this is not surprising, for the very policies which led to that flowering simultaneously opened the doors to the integration of Jews into all phases of Soviet life. As a result, there soon developed a pronounced decline in participation in these activities, a decline which has been noted by a number of observers of varying political views.

The veteran Bundist leader Gregory Aronson wrote (*The Jewish Problem in the Soviet Union*, 1944, p. 115):

. . . industrialization became one of the most decisive assimilating factors, among others, in Russia. It must be recognized that the mass influx of Jews into industry and into government institutions played an important and progressive role in the social and economic sense. . . . But it would be futile to seek in this progressive process evidence of a Jewish cultural, spiritual and national upsurge among the Jewish workers and [state] employees. (Translated from the Yiddish.)

More recently, Joshua Kunitz wrote (*Monthly Review*, April, 1953):

By the end of the '30s the Soviet Jewish youth had on the whole ceased to be Yiddish speaking. The number of students in the Yid-

dish schools had shrunk to about 60,000. The leadership of the Yiddish press had shrunk to the vanishing point. . . . Altogether, only a small, inbred middle-aged group of professional Yiddishists had remained to carry on, but they could not have lasted long. There can be little doubt that had it not been for state financing, most of the Yiddish cultural undertakings would have collapsed as long ago as the end of the '30s.

The Israeli historian, Dr. Raphael Mahler, reached the following conclusion from his observations (*History of the Jewish People*, cited in *Yiddishe Kultur*, June, 1958):

Despite the creation of a modern Yiddish school system and of Yiddish cultural institutions . . . by the government itself, the flourishing of the Socialist Yiddish culture in the Soviet Union did not have a long existence. . . . The assimilation proceeded with such a rapid tempo as has no equal in Jewish history. (Translated from the Yiddish.)

True, this trend was affected by the Nazi persecution and by the influx, during World War II, of Yiddish-speaking Jews saved by the Soviet Union from the Nazi gas chambers. But it has undoubtedly resumed its pace in the postwar period, and especially during the last decade with the development of the transition to a communist society.

Today the market for Yiddish publications is small, and is not measured by the fact that close to half a million Jews claim Yiddish as their mother tongue, important as this is in other respects. The actual demand is indicated rather by the fact that Vergelis, even while announcing the conversion of *Soviet Homeland* to a monthly, also stated that the number printed would not be increased. The *New York Times* reports (May 18, 1964): "The editors of Sovietish Heimland are understood to have rejected the idea of an expansion of the present circulation of 25,000 after an advertising campaign in areas with a potential Jewish readership failed to elicit a substantial number of subscriptions."

Further, the Leninist precept of the full equality of all nationalities, in contrast to bourgeois nationalism, regards this not as the means of endlessly perpetuating distinct national cultures but rather as the necessary basis for the eventual *amalgamation* of nations, a process dictated by the growth of a common economic life and a world economy. This process is already taking place in the Soviet Union, and will undoubtedly be speeded up as the transition to communism advances. An indication of this is given in a story by Theodore Shabad in the *New York Times* (October 20, 1963). He reports: "The Soviet

Union is quietly pressing a far-reaching plan to convert the present structure of the national republics into a system of regional federations. . . . The new system would be an intermediate stage toward the establishment of a unitary state based on a single 'Communist culture.'"

Clearly, such a process is bound to accelerate the assimilation of the Soviet Jews, which is a natural part of the general process of amalgamation, as Lenin has pointed out. In his polemics against the nationalism of the Jewish Bundists, after disassociating assimilation from forcible measures, he asks: "But does anything real remain in the concept of assimilation after excluding any violence and any kind of inequality?" To this he answers:

Unquestionably yes! There remains that universal historical tendency of capitalism to smash down national barriers, to erase national differences, to *assimilate* nations, which with each decade shows itself more powerfully, and which constitutes one of the greatest motive forces transforming capitalism to socialism. (*Lenin on the Jewish Question*, International Publishers, 1934, pp. 14-15.)

How much more powerfully does this historical tendency manifest itself when the transformation from capitalism to socialism has been completed and communism is on the way.

The passage to communism also brings with it a conscious reduction in the role of the state—a fact which those who insist on the restoration of a Yiddish state theater overlook. As far back as 1959, a Reuters dispatch stated (*New York Times*, January 18, 1959):

State subsidies are being withdrawn from a number of theaters in Moscow, Leningrad and other cities, the newspaper *Sovietskaya Kultura* reported today.

In the future the theaters will be self-supporting, relying on box-office proceeds.

The decision was taken by the Ministry of Culture at the request of the theaters as their "contribution to the building of communism."

This is associated with a growing attachment of such cultural institutions to people's organizations rather than the state, as well as a progressive blurring of the demarcation between professional and amateur status of participants. Thus, the Soviet journalist Solomon Rabinowich states ("Jewish Culture in the Soviet Union"):

[Critics] ask why haven't we a permanent professional theater—they recall the Mikhoels Theater, so famous in its time. We see no need to return to that today. The Jewish theater is developing along

new lines, with many amateurs participating as well as professionals. There is a tendency today to develop folk performances of all our nationalities—even a militia man may become an amateur actor, and the Jewish theater too is developing along these lines.

The fact is that the state of the Yiddish theater in the Soviet Union is far superior to that in the United States, where it has by now all but vanished. Here there are no touring companies performing before large audiences, and what remains of the once-flourishing Yiddish theater in New York is pathetic indeed.

Finally, one should not underestimate the significance of the huge volume of publication of Jewish works in Russian and other languages. To provide Jewish culture to the overwhelming majority of Soviet Jews—not to speak of the entire Soviet people—is to provide it in these languages. If the Soviet government were bent, as its enemies claim, on obliterating the cultural and spiritual life of Soviet Jews, *it would in the first place suppress this aspect*. But quite to the contrary, the dissemination of Jewish literature is fostered to a degree which is entirely unmatched in this country, and outstanding Jewish literary figures are officially honored in a manner which has no counterpart here. Clearly the Soviet regime, far from wishing to wipe out Jewish culture, views it as a vital element in Soviet cultural life and in the fusion of cultures which is beginning to take shape there.

Jews in Professional and Public Life

A favorite anti-Soviet canard is the allegation that a quota system for Jews exists in Soviet institutions of higher learning. For this allegation no direct proof is offered; rather, the existence of such a system is simply inferred from statistics on Jewish attendance at colleges and universities. In like fashion, an effort is made to demonstrate the systematic exclusion of Jews from various professions and from public posts.

The assumption underlying this procedure is that if the proportion of Jews in a given field is small or declining, this is of itself proof of deliberate exclusion—an obvious fallacy, since such fluctuations may be due to a variety of causes. If it appears credible, it is because in this country such exclusion does exist and hence the absence or limited participation of Jews in a particular field is most often a consequence of it.

Currently, Jews comprise about 1% of the total Soviet population but are 3% of the college population. In the thirties the percentage was much higher, and it is this decline which has been seized on by

such professional anti-Sovieters as Moshe Decter as evidence of a quota system ("The Status of the Jews in the Soviet Union," *Foreign Affairs*, January, 1963). But the drop can be explained by other factors, such as the rapid growth of literacy and college attendance among other nationalities as socialism developed and the exceptionally high casualty rate among Jews during World War II. Aside from this, the fact that Jews are $3\frac{1}{2}$ times as numerous among college students as they are in the total population can hardly be regarded as evidence that they are being excluded.

Decter similarly seeks to make capital of the fact that Jewish scientists have declined from 11% of the total in 1955 to 9.8% in 1960, thanks to a more rapid growth in the numbers of Russians and Ukrainians in this field than of Jews. This, he contends, reflects an official policy of restricting the access of Jewish youth to the universities and the professions in favor of others.

But it proves no such thing. University facilities and enrollments in the Soviet Union have been rapidly expanding, and this has been especially true with regard to the training of scientists. Hence special encouragement could well be given to other nationalities which have lagged behind the Jews in this field without necessarily lessening in any degree the accessibility of scientific training to Jewish youth. But this apparently does not occur to Decter, who is bent on proving the opposite.

Jews continue to form an exceptionally high proportion of those engaged not only in science but in other professional fields as well. Thus, they constitute 14.7% of all doctors, 14.0% of all writers, 10.4% of all lawyers, more than 13% of all artists and more than 23% of all composers. Such figures, again, are scarcely indicative of the existence of quota systems.

Nor is it true, as the fact sheet issued by the American Jewish Conference on Soviet Jewry alleges, that "Jews have virtually disappeared from key 'security-sensitive' areas such as the armed forces, diplomatic corps and membership in the Supreme Soviets of the 15 republics."

In the top echelons of the armed forces, Jews are represented by General of the Army Yakov Kreizer, Lieutenant-General David Dragunsky, more than 100 others with the rank of general and far greater added numbers of lower rank. Among Jews in top positions in the diplomatic and foreign services are N. Tsarapkin, Chief of the Soviet Mission at the Geneva Disarmament Conference, and G. Mendelevich, Secretary of the Soviet Mission to the United Nations.

Jews in high government posts include Deputy Premier and Chairman of the USSR Economic Council Veniamin Dymshitz, Cabinet

Minister of the Lithuanian Socialist Republic Ilya Beliavicus, Deputy Minister of Construction of the Byelorussian Socialist Republic Leonid Paperny, Deputy Chairman of the Minsk City Soviet Israel Kazhdan, as well as many others who are members of Supreme Soviets of republics and other bodies. There are, in all, 7,647 Jews among the deputies to Supreme and local Soviets.

To be sure, this number is considerably less than 1% of the total number of deputies, and this too is seized upon by Decter as supposed evidence of exclusion of Jews "as a security risk group—suspected of actual or potential disloyalty, of essential alien-ness." But here, too, mere smallness of numbers is not by itself proof of exclusion.* Certainly these "experts" would never think of playing such a "numbers game" in relation to, say, the current absence of Jews from the President's Cabinet or the relatively small numbers of Jews in state legislatures dominated by rural areas, or, for that matter, the small number of Jews in the U.S. Senate.

The contention that Jews have been virtually eliminated from "security-sensitive" areas as being alien and untruthworthy is clearly belied by the facts cited above (as it is also by the fact that some 400,000 Jews are members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union). It is contradicted also by the participation of Jewish scientists in such fields of work as the space program. Concerning this, the *New York Times* writer Harry Schwartz notes (June 16, 1964):

Speaking in Washington in 1959, Premier Khrushchev paid tribute to Soviet scientists of Jewish origin by indicating they had played a prominent role in Soviet space technology, which permitted the Soviet Union in that year to land a rocket on the moon. *But the names of Soviet space scientists have in general been kept secret as part of the security arrangements surrounding the Soviet space program.* (Emphasis added.)

The important fact is that Jews are actively involved in all phases of Soviet life, whatever their precise numbers, and that outstanding Jewish figures are to be found in every field of activity. Among these, in addition to the names already mentioned, are such representative individuals as the writer Ilya Ehrenburg, the physicist Lev Landau,

* One writer, for example, makes much of the questionable allegation that of 1,443 members of the Supreme Soviet only five are Jews. But even if we were to accept this, the fact is that if Jews were present in the same proportion as in the total population (1%) the number would be only 14. Where such small percentages are involved, differences such as this may easily be the result of chance fluctuations and hence devoid of political significance.

the psychologist A. R. Luria, the directors of the Bolshoi Theater and Bolshoi Ballet in Moscow and of the Maly Theater in Leningrad, the musicians David Oistrakh, Emil Gilels and Leonid Kogan. And there are many more.*

Nor has the Soviet government been sparing in its recognition of outstanding achievements by Jews, who comprise a considerable part of recent Lenin Award and other prize winners. Of this, Edmund Stevens, Moscow correspondent of the *Chicago Daily News*, writes (May 9, 1964):

Perhaps the best answer to charges current in the West that the Soviet government is conducting a Jew-baiting policy was provided by the recent awards of Lenin prizes. Out of nine prizes in science four were awarded to Jews. Out of four in literature and arts two were awarded to Jews, ballerina Maya Plisetskaya and cellist Mstislav Rostropovich.

Harry Schwartz points out (*New York Times*, June 16, 1964) that of 103 persons nominated for full membership in the Soviet Academy of Science at least 16 were Jewish, and of 438 nominated as corresponding members at least 58. These proportions, he notes, are well above the proportion of Jews among Soviet scientists.

Certainly, this is not a picture of exclusion. Rather, it demonstrates the very opposite. Far from suffering the discrimination which the anti-Soviet "experts" seek to manufacture through the torturing of statistics, Jews play an active and honored role in Soviet society.

Jews and Economic Crimes

In recent years, a considerable clamor has developed over the high proportion of Jews among those executed for economic crimes. Of roughly 150 such executions reported in the Soviet press, it is pointed out, about 60% involved individuals with Jewish names. And this, it is argued, can only be regarded as anti-Semitism, whether deliberate or otherwise.

Anti-Soviet circles in this country have made these executions the basis of a vicious campaign of slander, charging that they are designed to make the Jews scapegoats for the alleged failures of the Soviet economy and the corruption which, they claim, pervades all of Soviet society including the Communist Party itself. But expressions

*For a more comprehensive compilation, the reader is referred to the pamphlet by Herbert Aptheker mentioned above, which has been used as the source of these and certain other facts presented in this section, also of the quotation from Professor Berman cited below.

of alarm and protest have come also from individuals not hostile to the Soviet Union, notably from Bertrand Russell who some time ago addressed a letter to Premier Khrushchev on the subject.

The concern is understandable; nevertheless, the charge of anti-Semitism is unfounded in this case, too. The mere numbers of Jews involved are not in themselves proof of an anti-Semitic policy. To illustrate the point, in this country during the past decade several mass trials on narcotics charges have taken place in which virtually all the defendants were Italian. Yet no one has seriously charged the federal government with conducting an anti-Italian campaign, or even with being unintentionally anti-Italian. Why, then, is the Soviet government, on similar grounds, accused of being anti-Jewish? In part, because of the general hysteria which has been whipped up over "Soviet anti-Semitism"; in part because of the extreme severity of the sentences. But not because there is any direct proof that Jews are being singled out as such for execution.

The Soviet Union, as a socialist country in the process of transition to communism, takes an extremely dim view of economic crimes, regarding them as among the worst of offenses, and the penalties are correspondingly severe. In this respect, the Soviet scale of values differs greatly from that of capitalist society, in which graft and corruption are considered part of the normal mode of existence. In his reply to Bertrand Russell, Khrushchev makes pointed reference to this. He says:

Every state has its legislation. Our Soviet state also has its laws that are based on socialist morals. What is often regarded in bourgeois society as valiant is rejected by our morals and condemned by our laws. For example, it is not customary in bourgeois society to show interest in how and from where money has been accumulated. This, you see, is considered to be the private affair of the one who has made this capital. But this capital is made by means of exploiting, robbing millions of people, and sometimes even by way of murder and other crimes. In such a society a person possessing capital enjoys respect no matter how he made his money. Their principle is: a thief not caught is not a thief. But even when such a thief is caught red-handed he is not often put in prison. More often than not, this case does not even reach court because a person with money has his men among those who are called upon to control the observance of law. . . .

Our morals and our laws are based on other principles. The morals of our society are the morals of the working people. He who does not work, neither shall he eat—such are our morals. Our state, our society, with the help of laws, protects honest working people from

parasites, from idlers who trample upon the morals of socialist society and want to live by robbing others, or by appropriating, through dishonest machinations, the values in creating which they have not taken part.

The important question is whether the law is impartially enforced and trials are fair or not. And competent observers have noted that this is indeed the case. Thus, Professor Harold Berman of the Harvard Law School, on the basis of his observations while a Visiting Professor at the University of Moscow in 1962, stated:

In the past months I have read reports in American newspapers that anti-Semitism is supposedly growing in the Soviet Union. To my mind there is a large element of subjectivism and inaccuracy in these reports. I know they are often connected with the recent trials in the USSR of big speculators, thieves and embezzlers. However, this in my opinion, does not mean that discrimination is being pursued against the Jews. My Jewish friends in the Soviet Union, with whom I discussed this question, confirmed this. For among those convicted are not only Jews but individuals of other nationalities.

The reasons for the exceptional involvement of Jews in these crimes (and it should be noted that the number involved are but a minute fraction of the Jewish population) merit examination, which we do not propose to undertake here. But these reasons, the evidence indicates, must be sought elsewhere than in a policy of anti-Semitism.

The USSR and the U.S.

In the preceding pages, we have examined certain aspects of the status of Soviet Jews and the nature of the charge of anti-Semitism levelled against the Soviet government. We have not attempted to cover all of these charges. To do so would require much more space, and in any event the stream of such attacks is endless. But we believe that what we have dealt with is more than enough to demonstrate the false, slanderous character of the campaign against "Soviet anti-Semitism," by which so many honest Americans have been taken in.

This becomes all the more apparent when one examines the over-all conditions of life of Soviet Jews. Far from being ridden by discrimination and oppression and living in fear for their physical safety, as the anti-Soviet calumniators would have it, their lives are vastly more free of anti-Semitism than are those of American Jews.

While we do not condone the deprivation of even the smallest minority of its religion and culture, the fact is that questions of reli-

gious practice and Yiddish culture directly affect only a small and dwindling section of the Jewish people in the USSR. The question of criminality affects an especially minute part.

With regard to economic and social status, matters which affect all Jews directly, there is no doubt whatever of their freedom from discrimination to a degree unknown in this country.

In the Soviet Union, Jews are free to live wherever they please. This is not the case in the United States, where Jews are plagued by the all-too-familiar restrictive covenants and "gentlemen's agreements," and where the Jewish suburban communities have come to be referred to as "gilded ghettos."

Nor do Soviet Jews suffer the restrictions in employment characteristic of this country, particularly in higher-ranking positions. There, in addition to their prominent role in such professions as medicine, science, law, art and music, Jews are found widely employed as factory managers and executives. Here, writes Vance Packard in his book *The Status Seekers* (Cardinal Edition, 1961, p. 234):

... It is the rare large corporation that considers Jews on their qualifications alone in filling all its ranks. Some corporations shun Jews almost entirely. This is particularly true in insurance, banking, automobile making, utilities, oil, steel, heavy industry. Others profess hospitality to Jews; but then it often turns out that Jews are really welcomed only in the "inside jobs" requiring high intellectual capacity such as research, creativity, actuarial skill, etc. The "outside jobs," calling for contact with clients or the public or with stockholders, are primarily reserved for Gentiles.

Speaking of his studies in a middle-sized city which he designates as "Northeast City," Packard states (p. 235):

... I was looking for insights that might explain why the lines were drawn against Jews at many points in the city's social and business life, especially at the elite or upper-class level. I was curious to know, in the face of the frequently stated great respect for Jews, why few Jewish names appeared among the officers of most of the banks, utilities and large industrial firms. (Mostly, the leading Jews were merchants, lawyers, or textile plant operators.)

And only recently the American Jewish Committee, on the basis of a study of fifty leading public utilities, charged these companies with "discriminatory practices against Jews and other minority groups in the recruitment and promotion of management personnel," stating that "Jews made up less than 1 per cent of the total executive personnel in these utilities." (*New York Times*, December 29, 1963.)

As for quota systems in institutions of higher education, these have long existed in this country. Indeed, among American Jews they are a familiar fact of life.

Of all such restrictions, Soviet Jews are free, and they truly live as equals with all others. They are, in fact, highly resentful of the false charges of anti-Semitism levelled against the Soviet government. Thus, in a letter to the Anglo-Jewish weekly, the *Chicago Sentinel* (October 10, 1963), Dr. Allen Turban, who had only recently travelled in the Soviet Union, said: "Broadcasts and newspaper reports (attacking the Soviet policy toward Jews), without doing anyone any good, will simmer back to the Jewish people in the U.S.S.R., and I learned they resent it very much. One Rabbi I spoke to, resented it with anger."

To be sure, instances of discrimination and anti-Semitism occur. But these are remnants of the past, exceptions to excepted practice, and violations of Soviet law. In the United States, in contrast, these things *are* the accepted practice, the normal mode of behavior, and as yet scarcely touched by anti-discrimination laws.

There anti-Semitic and racist propaganda are outlawed; here such propaganda is freely distributed. Moreover, in our southern states racist and segregationist practices are *legally* sanctioned and are enforced even in open defiance of the Federal Constitution and decisions of the Supreme Court, while the Johnson Administration insists it is powerless to intervene in the face of unbridled violence, terror and murder. Indeed, whether actively or passively, officially or unofficially, our government has served in fact as the instrument of monopoly capital for the maintenance of its system of national oppression and chauvinism.

It was the Soviet Union which took special measures to save the lives of millions of Jews in the face of the Nazi onslaught. It was the Soviet Union which, by its outstanding role in the defeat of fascism, contributed most to preserving the future of Jews everywhere. It was the Soviet Union which was instrumental in securing the establishment of Israel. And it is the Soviet Union which today defends the existence of Israel against those who would attack it.

Drew Pearson, in his column of February 2, 1964, states:

Western diplomats were flabbergasted when Arab leaders ended their Cairo conference on a moderate note. No one knew at first why the Arabs, who had been breathing fire and brimstone, suddenly piped down.

U.S. diplomats have now learned the reason—a secret note received by the Arab states from the Kremlin warning them not to start war with Israel.

... The note reminded the Arabs that Premier Khrushchev's New Year's message had urged all powers to refrain from using force to settle boundary disputes and it was imperative that the Arab nations settle their differences with Israel by diplomatic means, not war.

Can there be any clearer indication that Soviet policy embraces the defense of the rights and freedom of *all* nations?

As we have stated, there are in our opinion grounds for criticism of Soviet policy in relation to the Jews, in particular of the failure to wage all-out war against the persistent remnants of anti-Semitism. *But such criticism must be made only within the framework of full recognition of the magnificent achievement of the Soviet Union in wiping out all national oppression and establishing the full equality of all nationalities.* In the case of the Soviet Jews, the transformation from the conditions of Tsarist days has been exceptionally great. Not to recognize these things, and to acquiesce in the accusations of anti-Semitic policies employed by the anti-Soviet forces as a cold-war weapon, is to do a disservice not only to the Jewish people, but also to the struggles of all oppressed peoples for their freedom and to the cause of world peace and friendship.